

### REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated February 7, 2008. In view of the foregoing amendments and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By the above amendment, claim 10 has been amended to more clearly distinguish the present invention over the applied prior art reference. Thus, claims 10-15 are currently pending in the present application.

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, claims 10, 12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schroeder et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4, 705,114). It is submitted that the present invention, as embodied by amended claim 10, now clearly patentably distinguishes over the Schroeder reference for the following reasons.

The present invention, as defined in amended independent claim 10, is directed to a fluid separator for separating oil and water. Claim 10 also recites that the second transport pipe is for transporting the separated oil, and a drainage pipe is provided for draining the separated water from the separator.

**Schroeder** discloses a multi chamber separation unit including a separator with several different upper and lower chambers (72, 73, 74, etc.) interconnected by means of piping (80) to form an integrated separation unit.

In Schroeder, the separator 23 only separates gas from liquid. The liquid that leaves the Schroeder pipe separator (via outlet 32 into conduit 36) still contains both water and oil. There is no disclosure or suggestion of the oil and water being in any way separated in the separator 23. Furthermore, the Schroeder separator has the following two outlets: a first outlet 29, which is for

gas, and a second outlet 32, which is for the oil and water together. Thus, as the oil and water are not separated, Schroeder fails to disclose or suggest a drainage pipe for draining the separated water from the separator and a second transport pipe for transporting the separated oil, as required in claim 10 as presently amended.

Furthermore, it is noted, with appreciation, that claims 11 and 13-14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. The Examiner therefore is requested to enter the above amendment, and pass this case to issue.

In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Per Eivind GRAMME et al.

By: 

Michael S. Huppert  
Registration No. 40,268  
Attorney for Applicants

MSH/kgf/kjf  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
May 5, 2008